

REMARKS

In an office action dated 13 March 2003, the Examiner rejects claims 1-16 and 33-48 (all pending claims). Applicant amends claims 1, 33, 45, 47, and 48. Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 1-16 and 33-48 (all pending claims) remain in the application.

Applicant has amended claims 11 and 45, 47 48 to correct the informalities cited by the Examiner. Applicant believes the amendment to claim 45 corrects the antecedent problem of claim 46. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. §112 ¶ 6 rejections to these claims be removed.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-16 and 33-48 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,604,516 issued to Herrod et al. (Herrod) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,288,976 issued to Citron et al. (Citron). In order to maintain a rejection the Examiner has the burden of providing evidence of *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP §2143. See also In Re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In order to prove *prima facie* obviousness, the Examiner must provide evidence in the prior art of a motivation to combine or modify a reference, a reasonable expectation of success, and a teaching of each and every claimed element. *Id.*

Amend claim 1 recites storing data from a bar code reader in an entity wherein said entity is a data object and storing identification information regarding the bar code reader of the data in the entity. Herrod does not teach storing the information in an entity that is a data object. Instead, Herrod teaches scan-ware that read custom property values from property file and configures a scanner interface based upon the property values. (See abstract). There is nothing in the Herrod that teaches the receiving of the

data from a bar code reader and storing the information in an entity along with an identification of the bar code reader.

The Examiner states that the use of visual basic teaches this limitation. However, visual basic is a language that allows a user to easily program windows type GUIs. When using visual basic, predefined functions are used to generate the displays. The functions may associate a field or form on the GUI with input from the device. In visual basic, an object is used that receives the input from the particular device and put the input in the field. There is no need to identify which device provided the input because the object was set to receive input from only one device. In claim 1, the method may receive input from another device besides the bar code reader. Thus it is important to identify the device providing the input to determine which field may receive the input. This allows more than one device to provide input to a field. Therefore, the use of visual basic does not teach the entity recited in claim 1.

Citron also does not teach storing the identification of a bar code reader and the data read by the reader in an entity that is a data object. Instead Citron teaches a system in which a bar code reader reads a bar code which is an instruction to perform a certain function such as deliver a message. When a bar code reader reads a bar coded instruction an identification of the reader and the data read are transmitted over a telephone line to a processor using DTMF tones. See Col. 5, line 62- Col. 6, line 2. In Citron, there is no mention of using data objects to store and manipulate the data. There is no need for a data object as the bar code reader does not store and manipulate the data. Further, the processing system that receives the data merely, reads the proper instruction to perform and does not need to manipulate the read data. Thus, there is no

need for the object. Thus, the limitations of storing the identification of the object are not taught by Citron.

Since neither Herrod nor Citron teach the limitations of storing data and an identification of a bar code reader in data object, the combination of the two reference does not teach the limitations. For this reason, the 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) rejection of claim 1 must be removed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow claim 1.

Even if the combination does teach the limitations of storing the data and identification of claim 1, there is no motivation to combine the references. As stated above. Citron teaches that when a bar code reader reads a bar coded instruction an identification of the reader and the data read are transmitted over a telephone line to a processor using DTMF tones. See Col. 5, line 62- Col. 6, line 2. The processor then uses the received data and reader ID to determine the instructions to execute. The data is not manipulated, thus there is no need for a data object that is able manipulate the data as is taught in Herrod or in the present invention. Thus, one skilled in the art that is designing a device in accordance with Herrod or Citron would have no need to look at the other reference to solve the problems with designing the respective systems. For this reason, the 35 U. S.C. § 103(a) rejection must be removed. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claim 1.

Claims 2-16 are dependent from claim 1. Thus, claims 2-16 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, the rejections to claims 2-16 must be removed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that claims 2-16 be allowed.

Claim 33 recites a device that performs the method of claim 1. Thus, claim 33 is a allowable for at least the same reasons as amended claim 1. Thus, the rejection of claim 33 must be removed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully requests that claim 33 be allowed.

Claims 34-48 are dependent from claim 33. Thus, claims 34-48 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 33. Thus, the rejections to claims 34-48 must be removed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that claims 34-48 be allowed.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment or any other aspect of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: *Jul 11 2007*


Andrew D. Gathy
Reg. No. 46,441

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. BOX 6149
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 586-9500